

Interview Summary

Application No.

09/551,332

Applicant(s)

BAUN ET AL.

Examiner

Jennifer E Winstedt

Art Unit

2872

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Jennifer E Winstedt.

(3)_____.

(2) John Eldredge.

(4)_____.

Date of Interview: 05 March 2001.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description:

Claim(s) discussed: 6 and 20.

Identification of prior art discussed: Krewalk et al..

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview(if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The applicant stated that the PC of Krewalk et al. is only an user interface and is not considered by the applicant to be the same as the control module recited in the claims. The applicant stated that the PC does not motor movement command signals to the motor processor. The examiner stated that she would have the look at the reference again, but that the PC could still probably be considered the command module. The applicants also stated that Krewalk does not disclose an encoder feedback system. The applicant's also they would fax in an amendment of claim 20 making it clear that there are two intelligent motor portions. The examiner stated that this amendment might overcome the 102 rejection of claim 20.

Interview Summary

Application No.

09/551,332

Applicant(s)

BAUN ET AL.

Examiner

Jennifer E Winstedt

Art Unit

2872

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Jennifer E Winstedt.

(3) John Eldredge.

(2) Kenneth Baun.

(4) Cassandra Spyrou.

Date of Interview: 27 March 2001.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☒ Yes e) ☐ No.

If Yes, brief description: *The applicants showed a the examiners a version of the telescope system .*

Claim(s) discussed: 6.

Identification of prior art discussed: *Krewalk et al.*

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The applicants stated that the patentability of the invention rests in how the command processor and the motor control processors communicate with each other and what each processor does independently of each other. They said said that they would come in with secondary considers and would be correlated with the point of nonobviousness. They also stated that they would put more of the functionality of the invention into the claims. The examiners stated that they would look over everything when it came in, do an update search, and give the applicants a call.